

Cont  
A1

said base surface having a concave radius, which is matched to said convex chime radius, and

a lockband surrounding said outer wall, whereby tightening of said lockband causes said concave base surface to fully engage said convex chime in a sealing relationship.

---

**Remarks**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of currently pending Claims 1-4 is earnestly solicited in light of the above amendments.

As recited in Claim 1, as amended, the subject invention is directed to a drum having a convex upper chime and a lid having a concave base surface, wherein the convex chime radius and the base surface radius are matched such that tightening of a lockband causes the concave base surface and convex chime to fully engage each other in a sealing relationship. Such full engagement between the base surface and the chime obviates the need for a gasket to be placed in a channel in the mouth of the lid.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Bordner et al. Bordner et al. discloses a drum body 12 having an upper chime 54 and a lid 16 with a closure cavity 60, the closure cavity further having a seal cavity 76 for accepting a gasket 78. When the drum and lid are closed by use of clamp 40, the cavity 60 receives the chime 54, but the cavity and chime do not fully engage to form a sealing relationship. Instead, the closure cavity 60 is interrupted by the seal cavity 76, and a seal is formed only with the aid of gasket 78 placed in seal cavity 76. Bordner et al. thus does not disclose the concave base surface fully engaging the upper chime, as recited in Claim 1.


Claims 2 and 3 also stand rejected as anticipated by Bordner et al. However, these claims are both dependent on Claim 1, and Bordner et al. does not anticipate these claims for the same reason as discussed above.

Claim 3 further stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bordner et al. in view of Cramer et al. However, as Bordner et al. does not teach all the limitations of Claim 1, as amended, as discussed above, this rejection also is traversed.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Bordner et al. However, as Bordner et al. does not teach all the limitations of Claim 1, as amended, as discussed above, this rejection also is traversed.

It is believed that the application now is in condition for allowance, and early notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Oldach III  
Registration No. 42,048

Date: 10/4/2002

VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND PLEASE LLP  
1828 L Street, NW., Eleventh Floor  
Washington, DC 20036-5109  
202-467-8800

## APPENDIX

### VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

#### IN THE CLAIMS:

**The Claims are amended as follows:**

1. (Amended) A reusable sealable plastic drum comprising

a plastic drum body with a convex upper chime having a convex chime radius.

a plastic lid having an annular, peripheral mating channel sized to accept said upper chime, said channel having an inner wall, an outer wall, a mouth for receiving said upper chime, and a base surface for engaging said upper chime, said base surface having a concave radius, which is matched to said convex chime radius, and

a lockband surrounding said outer wall, whereby tightening of said lockband causes said concave base [radius] surface to fully engage said convex chime [radius] in a sealing relationship.